REMARKS

<u>Summary of the Office Action</u>

Claims 1-33 have been considered in the Office Action.

Claims 29-33 have been objected to because the claims have been incorrectly number 30-34, respectively.

Claim 27 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because the claim includes the trademark Pantone.®

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10-12, 28 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Jackelen et al. U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0053810 ("Jackelen").

Claims 4-5, 9, 13-15 and 18-27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Jackelen and Behlok U.S. Patent No. 6,469,805 ("Behlok").

<u>Reply to the Claim Objections</u>

Applicants have amended claims 29-33 to correct the claim numbers. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the claim objections be withdrawn.

<u>Reply to the § 112, second paragraph Rejection</u>

Applicants have cancelled claim 27 without prejudice. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that the § 112, second paragraph rejection is now moot.

<u>Reply to the § 102(e) Rejections</u>

Applicants have amended claim 10 to more particularly describe and distinctly claim the invention. Support for the claim amendment may be found at least at page 10, line 29 through page 11, line 3.

Independent claims 1 and 6 recite methods for analyzing a print job, the methods including receiving page description language ("PDL") commands that describe the print job, interpreting the PDL commands, identifying a print setting from the interpreted commands that affects the entire print job or a printer factor associated with the printer, and reporting the identified print setting or print factor. Amended independent claim 10 recites a method for analyzing a print job comprising an object having an associated print attribute, the method including determining a print attribute

7

of interest, associating a corresponding unique marker to the determined attribute, receiving PDL commands that describe the print job, interpreting the PDL commands to process the object, determining if the attribute associated with the processed object matches the determined attribute, and reporting the results of any matched object using the corresponding unique marker. The cited references do not describe the claimed invention.

Jackelen describes methods of detecting and notifying a print operator of a mismatch state resulting from an incompatibility between print job attributes and printer resources or capabilities when the mismatch state occurs after a rater image processor has begun to render the print job. (¶0003, lines 2-8). In particular, a print job is received, the print job header is parsed, and the print job attributes are determined. (¶0018, lines 3-5). Next, a pre-job mismatch check is performed to determine if there is a mismatch between any print job attributes specified in the job header and the available printer resources and capabilities. (¶0018, lines 5-9). If there is no pre-job mismatch, each page is individually rendered. (¶0019, lines 1-3). As each page is rendered, an inquiry is made to determine if any mismatch exists between individual page attributes and the available printer resources and capabilities. (¶0019, lines 3-6). If no mismatch is detected, the page is sent to the marking engine for printing. (¶0019, lines 6-9).

Unlike the claimed invention, Jackelen does not describe or suggest methods that include <u>reporting identified print settings or print factors, or reporting the results of any matched object using a corresponding unique marker</u>. Indeed, Jackelen does not describe or suggest anything regarding such claimed reporting, and the Office action has not identified any description or suggestion.

Instead, the Office action at pages 3 and 4 states that Jackelen paragraph 19, lines 6-9 describes such reporting. As indicated above, however, the cited portion merely states that if no page mismatches are detected, the page is sent to the marking engine for printing. That is, the page is printed normally. Nothing about such routine printing pertains to reporting an identified print setting or print factor, and the Office action has not identified any such teaching.

Because Jackelen does not describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that the § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 6 and 10 should be withdrawn. In addition, because claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-26 and 28-33 depend from

claims 1, 6 and 10 respectively, applicants further respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 2-5, 7-9, 11-26 and 28-33 also should be withdrawn. Further, because the cited references do not describe or suggest the claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-26 and 28-33 should be allowed.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, applicants submit that this application, including claims 1-26 and 28-33, is allowable. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner allow this application.

Respectfully submitted,

___/James Trosino/_____
James Trosino
Registration No. 39,862
Attorney for Applicants